



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,413	06/01/2001	Jose Iborra	CHG-001.1P	3929
26717	7590	02/26/2004	EXAMINER	
FALK AND FISH 16590 OAK VIEW CIRCLE MORGAN HILL, CA 95037			CHAVIS, JOHN Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2124	7
DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/872,413

Applicant(s)

IBORRA ET AL.

Examiner

John Chavis

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6-1-01, 10-1-01, 6-13-02 and 7-15-02.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.6.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodwin in view of Features of VDM Tools (23-9-98), and further in view of Koob.

CLAIMS:

Goodwin

1. An automated software production tool, comprising: a software generating computer programmed to: receive user input that defines a conceptual model which models a system for which a computer program is to be written;

See the title and the abstract.

convert said conceptual model into a high level repository of formal specification statements stated in a

See the generating portion of the abstract (last phrase of the first sentence). In reference to the

formal language having rules of syntax  
and semantics;

syntax and semantics portions,  
see the parsing portion of fig. 5.

Note also the definition of parsing  
(attached IEEE Definitions, inherently  
provides for the syntax and semantics  
features).

validate said formal specification using  
a validator program which, using the  
rules of syntax and semantics of said  
formal language, verifies that every  
statement in said formal specification  
is syntactically complete, semantically  
correct and not ambiguous.

The formal specification feature is  
unclear and unclear features are not  
entitled patentable weight. However,  
the feature is being interpreted as the  
converted portion above being  
validated. Although the feature of  
Testing converted programs is  
considered inherent in Goodwin' s  
system to ensure the conversion is

correct (col. 15 lines 58-65), Goodwin does not specifically mention it. However, the feature is taught by the article (cited prior art reference) entitled, Features of VDM Tools (23-9-98), to ensure the specification is correct (see the first and second pages). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the feature in Goodwin's system for that same reason to ensure the specifications are correct.

The feature is also taught by Koob for the same reason indicated above and

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the invention above to verify specifications, see section 3.

2. The system according to claim 1, wherein said software-generating computer is programmed to receive said user input using a CASE tool program for presenting a graphical user interface (GUI) to allow a user to input the requirements of said formal specification using a graphical tools to model said conceptual model graphically.

The references in claim 1 are not to specifically indicated the CASE tools or the GUI features; however, the features are taught by the cited prior art reference to Koob et al. to enable the user to incorporate formal specifications easier (via the GUI). Therefore, it would have been obvious To a person of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to utilize the  
feature of claim 1 for the same reasons.

3. The system according to claim 1  
wherein said software-generating  
computer is further programmed with a  
system logic translator, which controls  
said computer to process said formal  
language specification into one or more  
computer programs that can control a  
computer to carry out all the functions  
modeled in said formal specification.

See the rejection of claim 2 above.

4. The system according to claim 3  
wherein said software-generating  
computer is further programmed with a  
user interface translator, which controls  
said computer to process said formal  
language specification into one or more  
computer programs that can control a  
computer to implement a particular user

See again the rejection of claim 2.

interface for the program created by  
said system logic translator which has  
been modeled in said formal  
specification.

5. The system according to claim 3  
wherein said software-generating  
computer is further programmed with a  
database generator, which controls said  
computer to process said formal  
language specification into a data  
structure or database is capable of  
storing the values of at least all  
attributes of all objects defined in  
said formal specification in a manner  
such that the program or programs  
generated by said system logic  
translator can control a computer to  
read the values of said attributes at  
any time or store new values for said

See again the rejection of claim  
2 above.

attributes at any time.

6. The system according to claim 1                      See any of the references.  
wherein said software-generating  
computer is further programmed by a  
documentation generator for producing  
documentation for the software  
application based on the formal  
specification.

In reference to claims 7, 13-15, 17-20, and 23-24, see the rejection of claim 1.

As per claims 8-10, see the rejection of claims 3-5.

The features of claims 11-12 are taught via claims 3 and 2, respectively.

Claim 16 is taught via claim 2.

In reference to claims 21-22, see the rejection of claim 3.




Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Chavis whose telephone number is (703) 305-9665. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jc  
February 23, 2004

  
JOHN CHAVIS  
PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2124